



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 90th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

INTRODUCTION OF AMENDMENTS TO THE CIGARETTE LABELING AND ADVERTISING ACT

MR. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, I am glad to cosponsor Senator MAGNUSEN's bill again this year. Requiring the disclosure of the tar and nicotine content of cigarettes will, I think, encourage the development of lower tar, lower nicotine cigarettes. And since the amount of tar in a cigarette is associated with the incidence of cancer, and the amount of nicotine is related to heart disease, encouraging the development of lower tar, lower nicotine cigarettes is a worthwhile endeavor.

I hope that Congress will enact this badly needed legislation this year. And I congratulate the Senator from Washington for his efforts in this important area. I look forward to working with him on other proposals in this field.

For this legislation, while important, is only a first step. As the Senator from Washington indicated in his thoughtful remarks today, this legislation will only help a smoker "in choosing the dosage of his 'poison'."

I believe we must take significantly greater action to discourage people from smoking at all and especially to discourage young people from starting to smoke.

Secretary Gardner testified recently that—

While large numbers of adults are giving up smoking, even larger numbers of young people are taking up the habit.

This observation was confirmed by the president of the American Cancer Society, Dr. Ashbel C. Williams, in a recent speech. Dr. Williams said that 1.5 million American children between the ages of 12 and 16 began smoking last year. That is well over 4,000 youngsters a day. I ask unanimous consent that a news report of that speech be inserted in the Record at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

EXHIBIT A

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 1, 1967]
CIGARETTE SMOKING BY VERY YOUNG ON INCREASE, CANCER SOCIETY IS TOLD
(By Nate Hascilone)

PALM BEACH, Fla., March 31.—Increasing numbers of adults are quitting smoking, but the opposite is true for youngsters, the president of the American Cancer Society said today.

Dr. Ashbel C. Williams, a Jacksonville cancer surgeon, told the Society's ninth science writers' seminar that cigarette smoking may be the worst, most intimate and dangerous air pollutant of today.

He said studies show that 1.5 million children between the age of 12 to 16 years took up cigarette smoking last year (1966).

But he added that this was partially compensated by the fact that "an impressive and mounting number of Americans have quit smoking cigarettes, and many more have drastically reduced their consumption of nicotine and tars (that is, switched to filter tip cigarettes)."

On the same program, Dr. Eva J. Salber of Harvard University reported her results of a progressive study of cigarette smoking habits of students in public schools of Newton, Mass. Some epidemiologists regard the Salber survey as a national standard of the juvenile habit.

She found that, despite the study and efforts to educate against cigarettes, few had quit smoking in the five and a half years since the survey's start, that more youngsters, the president of that one third of the nonsmokers at the study's start had by now adopted the habit, and that the group as a whole now had twice the number of its original cigarette smokers.

Dr. Williams said reductions in cigarette smoking by Americans have proved less impressive than reductions in cigarette smoking among Europeans.

In Great Britain, he said, the number of cigarette smokers 16 years of age and older dropped by almost half a million between 1961 and 1965, while the general population rose in the same period by more than 12.5 million.

In Norway, he added, in a recent 5-year period, there was a decrease of about 10 percent of boy smokers from 13 to 19 years of age.

MR. KENNEDY of New York. And a pioneer study by Dr. Eva J. Salber, of the Harvard School of Public Health, shows that decisions by young people whether or not to smoke are made very early. A recent editorial in the Christian Science Monitor summarizes Dr. Salber's findings and their implications, and I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

EARLY SMOKERS

Back in 1959, Dr. Eva J. Salber of the Harvard School of Public Health studied the smoking habits of nearly 1,000 tenth-graders at a suburban New England high school. In 1963, she did a follow-up. The results are informative. She found:

Before the age of 13, most youngsters have already decided whether or not they plan to smoke.

Those who are smoking by 13 are likely to still be smoking at 21.

Those teenagers who have tried smoking but stopped are likely to start again. Seventy-one percent of those who said they had stopped at 15 later resumed smoking.

Cigarette consumption shot up between the ages of 15 and 21. By 21, young smokers were averaging 6 to 6.5 packs a week. In addition, the number of young people smoking had nearly doubled in that period. On both

scores, girls trailed the men only slightly. Nonsmokers at age 15 were able to predict with no little accuracy their future smoking habits. Of those who expected to smoke, almost 70 percent did so by age 21, while of those who did not intend to start, fewer than 30 percent took up the habit.

The study, Dr. Salber felt, showed that education to discourage cigarette smoking ought to begin with children as young as 10 years. She felt, further, that youngsters are unimpressed by condemnation of smoking as a major health hazard and that appeals made on aesthetic or moral grounds would probably be more effective. And she stressed that educational efforts directed toward children would accomplish little if parents, whose influence on them is so considerable, were not also reached.

We take seriously these findings by Dr. Salber. Also, her counsel as to how best approach solving the problem. Statistics clearly show that we have not begun to reach the young on this question. To do so will take far more effort than we have as yet expended, a far more persuasive appeal, and a much earlier start.

MR. KENNEDY of New York. I cannot emphasize too strongly the importance of this matter for the health of millions of Americans.

One physician told me recently that if he had his choice as a matter of health policy between immediately having enough doctors and nurses and hospital beds to remedy our serious national shortages in these areas, and getting every American who smokes cigarettes to stop, he would choose the latter. Far more lives, he told me, would be saved by getting the 48 million Americans who now smoke to stop than would be saved by solving all of our health, manpower, and facility shortages.

That is quite a startling statement. But the facts support it. The Surgeon General's report—based upon thousands of studies over the years and confirmed and supplemented by some 1,500 studies since—told us over 3 years ago that smoking is a lethal activity. The latest report came only 2 weeks ago when the Public Health Service published the results of an ambitious empirical study of the higher incidence of disease and death among smokers than among nonsmokers. Senator MAGNUSEN describes the results of the study in his remarks today, and I would only add that Senators may be interested in seeing two news reports of the issuance of the new report, one from the New York Times and the other from United Press International. I ask unanimous consent that they be inserted in the Record at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record,

1005072508

as follows:

From the New York Times, May 2, 1967]
SMOKING IS LINKED TO LOSS OF TIME FROM WORK AND RECREATION

(By Harold M. Schmeck, Jr.)

WASHINGTON, May 1.—American men who smoke cigarettes lose about 27 per cent more time from jobs and recreation than do nonsmokers, according to a Government report made public today.

The same document showed that smokers and former smokers of both sexes tended to have more of such chronic health problems as heart disease, bronchitis, emphysema, sinusitis and peptic ulcers.

A survey involving interviews in 42,000 American households provided the data for the report.

The findings were based on responses from a sample that was considered representative of the adult civilian population of the United States, the report said. Men and women in institutions were excluded.

The survey was made in 1964 and 1965, when an estimated total of 51 per cent of men over 17 were cigarette smokers and 19 per cent were former smokers.

The report, published today by the National Center for Health Statistics, said the strongest relationship had been found between smoking habits and the presence of chronic bronchitis, emphysema or some combination of the two.

But the data did not prove that smoking was the cause of the higher rates of illness among smokers revealed by the survey, the report said.

"The most these data can do is demonstrate the lack of or the existence of a relationship between cigarette smoking and various health characteristics. It cannot establish any existing relationship as a causal one," the report said.

In several categories the relationship between the physical ailments and smoking was stronger for former smokers than for present smokers.

Thus, men smokers reported 27 per cent more "restricted-activity days" resulting from illness than did nonsmokers. But former smokers reported 44 per cent more days in which their activities were restricted than did men who had never smoked.

"We know from other kinds of evidence that cigarette smoking is closely related to certain causes of death including cardiovascular disease, cancer, chronic respiratory disease and peptic ulcers," said William H. Stewart, Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, in a statement.

"This particular study does not seek to explain this association," he continued. "It simply, and for the first time, shows the extent of this relationship as regards illness and disability."

The Surgeon General was quoted in an announcement of the report's publication as saying that it was the latest chapter in the story relating cigarette smoking to the nation's health.

The Tobacco Institute, representing cigarette manufacturers, said a survey of this kind could not be expected to provide meaningful conclusions and could be highly misleading. It appears to be a study based largely on self-diagnosis and secondhand information, the institute said in a statement.

The Government survey found that 72.1 per cent of men who smoked more than two packs a day had at least one chronic condition that impaired health. Such conditions were found in 53.5 per cent of men who never smoked.

In some instances the report distinguished between smokers according to the amount they smoked; in other instances no distinction was made.

The Public Health Service's National Clearinghouse for Smoking and Health used the survey figures to estimate that cigarette smokers lost 77 million more work days than nonsmokers every year. The clearinghouse said: " . . . this was almost 19 per cent of the ratio . . . annual work loss from illness.

NEW STUDY CITES SMOKING'S DANGER

WASHINGTON, D.C.—The public health service said Monday that heart disease is about 70% more prevalent among men who smoke two or more packs of cigarettes a day than those who do not smoke.

A new study, released by United States Surgeon General William Stewart, also showed a strong statistical relationship between the smoking habit and chronic bronchitis or emphysema—respiratory diseases which often lead to a slow, painful death.

The report was disputed by the cigarette industry.

The Tobacco Institute issued a six page critique asserting that no scientific cause and effect relationship between smoking and disease had been established.

Here are some of the findings:

Among those who are smoking about one pack of cigarettes a day, the incidence of heart disease is about the same as it is for nonsmokers.

But the heart disease ratio is about 70% higher among two pack a day smokers. Heart irregularities were found in 44% more cases among smokers than abstainers.

Some 77 million workdays are lost because of illnesses associated with cigarette smoking each year. Persons who smoke spend a third as much as time away from their jobs as those who do not smoke.

Chronic bronchitis or emphysema afflicts two and a half times as many male smokers as it does men who have never smoked. The rate for women smokers is twice that of female nonsmokers.

The Tobacco Institute said the study was "based largely on self-diagnosis and secondhand information."

It cited as one contradiction the report's finding that former smokers have higher rates of many diseases than present smokers. "This does not suggest that giving up smoking is harmful, anymore than it suggests it might be helpful," the institute said.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York.
Smoking only became a national habit after World War II. Beginning in 1930, when there were only 2,500 lung cancer deaths in this country, an alarming rise in lung cancer began. Now, a generation later, 20 times as many people die from lung cancer each year.

Reliable evidence shows that 40,000 of the 50,000 lung cancer deaths every year are associated with cigarette smoking. The Surgeon General, Dr. William Stewart, tells us that 250,000 Americans die before their time each year as a result of diseases associated with cigarette smoking—lung cancer, heart disease, emphysema, bronchitis, and other kinds of cancer. Other reliable estimates put the figure at closer to 300,000 deaths.

These quarter of a million to 300,000 deaths are "excess" deaths. People who do not smoke sometimes die prematurely, of course. But a quarter of a million or more extra premature deaths occur among cigarette smokers every year.

And that is not all. It is not just a question of dying. Cigarette smokers suffer an extra 12 million chronic conditions as opposed to the nonsmoking population; an extra 300,000 heart attacks every year, an extra 1 million cases of chronic respiratory disease.

These diseases are disabling and unpleasant.

Take emphysema, for example.

Emphysema is a condition which occurs when the lungs weaken and fill chronically with fluid after many years of breathing impurities. The person who suffers from emphysema is unable to catch his breath and spends hours at a

time gasping for air. It is not a pleasant experience. Emphysema is 13 times more prevalent among cigarette smokers than nonsmokers.

Let us look at it generationally. Over 4,000 schoolchildren start smoking every day. If this rate continues, 1 million children now in school will die of lung cancer, to say nothing of all the premature deaths from other causes and the painful chronic diseases that will result. These are incontrovertible, proven facts. Indeed, if you add up all the figures, 27 million Americans now alive, including infants and children who have not begun to smoke, will die before their time as a result of diseases associated with cigarette smoking.

These, then, are the facts about cigarette smoking. Yet, wherever we go, we are assaulted with invitations and exhortations to smoke—on television, on the radio, in newspapers, and on billboards. In all, nearly \$300 million a year is spent to urge us, and particularly young people, to smoke cigarettes. A recent article in the Houston Post described these efforts in graphic terms, and I ask unanimous consent that it be included in the Record at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Houston (Tex.) Post, Feb. 5, 1967]
TV'S HOTTEST STAR—He Rides THE HIGH COUNTRY AND SAILS THE ROLLING WAVE

(By Mike McGrady)

Television's Star-of-the-Year! Today, with this small salute to the very best the small screen has to offer, we pause and honor a personality of demonstrated durability and versatility.

Though banned from ever appearing on British television, he has dominated this country's video screens longer than Ed Sullivan. Though regularly attacked by a formidable array of critics, he is seen more frequently than Gail Storm. And though a convicted killer, he has managed more major comebacks than Milton Berle.

But an end to suspense. This year's big winner is . . . your ever-popular Cigarette.

And, ironically enough, for a time there it looked like Cigarette might not make it back for another season. The trouble began three years ago when the surgeon general of the U.S. blamed Cigarette for lung cancer—the following year, 18,000,000 people gave up the Cigarette habit. It wasn't long before Cigarette was forced to wear a small disparaging sign ("Caution: Cigarette Smoking May Be Hazardous to Your Health"). And while the sign was never seen on television, many felt no star could long survive this sort of public humiliation.

But they underestimated Cigarette's well-established image. It was known, for one thing, that he was incredibly sexy. He was seen on public beaches with bikini-wearing beauties; he was caressed by glamorous women in low-cut gowns—one still recalls that memorable night he appeared in Julie London's embrace before an open fire as she crooned huskily, "You get a lot to like . . . with a Marlboro Filter . . . flavor . . . slip-top box."

Miss London's enthusiasm was shared by many, particularly by athletes. If Arnie Palmer walked a mile in those days, it was not a matter of physical conditioning; it was for a Camel. And this held true not just for athletes, but for all the better people. Cigarette was photographed at the better nightclubs, sometimes merely reclining beside a top hat and a silk scarf.

Moreover, Cigarette even seemed to have the approval of . . . scientists. Kent Cigarette had developed this marvelous Micronite filter and was always saying, "No medical evidence or scientific endorsement has proved

1005022509

any other cigarette to be superior to Kent which was all very reassuring. It meant nothing.

However, all this ended in 1951 with Cigarette's self-imposed Cigarette Advertising Code. The code was an attempt to change the image, specifically to make Cigarette less attractive to young people. It banned the mention of nicotine and tar percentages; it barred such pseudo-scientific phrases as "Micronite filter" and "multifilter" and "activated charcoal."

Finally, and most damaging of all, Cigarette could never again—not ever—convey the idea that "smoking is essential to social prominence, distinction, success or sexual attraction." What was left? Time magazine predicted that Cigarette would be able to say nothing more positive than perhaps "a smoke's a smoke."

But somehow Cigarette, even without a Micronite filter to his name, managed to cut a relatively dashing figure, and during 1966, more than 75,000,000 Americans spent more than \$8 billion for a record-breaking \$42 billion smokes. And manufacturers kept Cigarette on television by spending \$170 million for the year.

And though every effort had been taken to dim Cigarette's appeal to the young, 53 per cent of people between the ages of 16 and 19 have taken up the Cigarette habit and now spend \$10 million a week for the pleasure. And, interestingly enough, five of the 10 television shows most favored by youngsters feature Cigarette commercials.

By adhering strictly to the code, advertisers can talk about taste and flavor and little else. In truth, there are two basic Cigarette tastes. The first smoke of the day tastes about the way you would expect burning foliage to taste, that is if you were of a mind to taste burning foliage. By the end of the day the taste is measurably closer to that of . . . hot nitric acid. The adjectives used to describe Cigarette flavor convey a somewhat different impression—big, rich, real, smooth, fine, mild, cooler, natural, pleasing, fresh, good, rewarding, right, special, nice, full, best, different, welcome and fulfilling.

But the lasting appeal of Cigarette on television has little to do with words. What is important is image, the visual story. And in the most memorable Cigarette dramas, words do nothing more than paint in a Hemmingwayesque backdrop.

Words like, "Head! for the high country. There's a new snow, and good huntin' up there. Up in Marlboro Country." Words like, "Fall roundup. And a chuck wagon on a chilly morning. A warm fire. And a man's favorite smoke . . ."

As the words are spoken, a helicopter soars down from a nearby hill and lands beside the chuck wagon. Cigarette is carried out by a fellow bearing a striking resemblance to Matt Dillon—the jaw, the cowboy hat, the sheepskin jacket—and he squats on his haunches beside the campfire. He thumbs through the trail boss' report. He lights up the Cigarette made from the Richmond recipe as other cowhands shuffle around in lean, leather-faced silence. Then he mounts his copter and soars off over the hill.

Marlboro Country is not far, as the crow flies, from Camel Country. Which, in turn, is reasonably near Salem Country. Which is just a river and a mountain from Viceroy Country and so on.

One of the current Camel epics opens on the sea. Behind the crest of a large rolling wave, a single mast rises. The wave rolls by and we see the small boat, the crew in windbreakers, the spray crashing over the bow. ("Born rich, rich in real taste . . .") Or we're on a freight train carrying a path through forestland while the engineer and the motor-Born with the new Camel so you know it's got a big head start on taste . . .") Or a surfer stands before an ocean crashing over black rocks. ("The great Camel heritage of real taste . . .")

Over in Salem Country, the atmosphere is over one of near-surgical cleanliness. Near-surgical, incidentally, is not a phrase they'd be apt to use here. The opening shot—a towering waterfall tumbling several hundred

feet down a mountainside. ("Ever try smoking Salem-style?") At the edge of a pool below, a man has built a campsite. ("Maybe it's time you did.") He lights up with a chunk of log retrieved from the fire—the coffeepot is bubbling and a canoe is anchored to the shoreline. ("Not just a different brand, but a different taste.")

Meanwhile, in Viceroy Country, a main-moth skyscraper is being raised. ("Another floor is done, work's goin' great.") And the workmen wearing tin hats are riding an elevator up through the spine of the steel skeleton. ("Now is the time you say, give me a Viceroy smoke. It's got the taste that's right. Right any time of the day.") Then, a closeup of the Viceroy smoker—he wears the tin hat but he also wears a white shirt and necktie and at the end of the drama, he parks his pack beside his blueprints.

The implications are clear. The Viceroy man is a structural engineer, possibly an architect, but definitely not one of your run-of-the-mill Mohawk Indians who specialize in skyscraper construction. The Marlboro man arrives by helicopter. Instead of faithful steed is clearly no ordinary cowhand with torn jeans. The L&M ad goes still a step further—here Cigarette is seen on a yacht with spinnakers full. Though the code specifically prohibits linking Cigarette with "social prominence" or "distinction" or "success," these factors are always lurking in the background. It's a minimum of 20 grand a year for most smokers and in some instances, make it closer to six figures.

Even when they contrive to put Cigarette in a totally insane setting, there is the hint of affluence, generally affluence coupled with a sense of excitement. The many people who have foolishly vowed to eat their hats if they found a filter that would deliver true tobacco taste, the black-eyed stalwarts who would rather fight than switch—they are movie stars besieged by photographers, ship captains, jazz trumpeters and so forth.

But the emphasis there is basically comedic. In the true Cigarette dramas it is more often a picture of man pitting his strength against elemental forces—wind, wilderness, structural steel. It is man unafraid of storms at sea, heights, sky-diving misadventures and, presumably, lung cancer. It is man armed with little more than Cigarette, and often as not, that's enough.

However, the never Cigarette tends to be found in a more modern setting and the appeal is to a less active mind. They are invariably observers, not participants. They are seen in football stadiums and at cocktail parties. And the most noticeable quality uniting them all is a tremendous susceptibility to suggestion.

Let one person, for example, whisper, "Harmey's got a good thing going—pass it on," and they all, with unbridled glee, pass that very message along. One lamebrain begins snapping his fingers and before 60 seconds go by, a roomful of people are snapping their fingers, quite frequently with minimal success.

"Another flat tire," says the stunt pilot. "Give this menthol brand a try. Sure doesn't taste like much."

"Well, have you tried this one?" asked the Kool smoker.

"Hey! This tastes fine!"

Or perhaps the scene is a summer lawn party. Tennis racquets are in evidence. One man, clearly the life of the party, shows everyone how long his Cigarette is. Everyone, naturally, is amazed. "Say, that cigarette is longer! what is it?" His explanation is terse but wordy: "The long cigarette. Long on flavor. Filter-tipped Pall Mall. Try one." The first to try is the lovely blonde, the kind of girl that used to dominate the precode commercials, and says says. "Mmmmm, I like that." And in less than a minute her mind is made up: "I know what I like. And I like Pall Mall."

L & M Cigarette, a brand that tries a new approach every few months, is working on the susceptibility theme. The current L&M hit pictured a bandstand and—"Last year only two members of the band at Anton's smoked L&M. Irving on piano and Charlie on

sax. Now Sam the bass player's come over." It would seem, from studying the scene, there are two holdouts. However, the girl vocalist, another precode type, is belting out "Come on over to the L&M side, come on over for the taste of it . . ." and must be reckoned at least sympathetic to the cause.

However, the most co-operative of them all are the Lark smokers. A sound truck drives by and a man is holding up a sign: "Show Us Your Lark Pack" and passerby go into a cold sweat trying to locate a pack to hold up. That's not bad enough. They each insist on relating an incredibly pedestrian little tale—

"My father-in-law was visiting several months ago and while he was here I ran out of cigarettes. And he opened up his suitcase and there was a whole carton. And you know what they were? Larks. Well, we finished off his carton and I had to buy my own then. Been buyin' 'em ever since." And there's a woman: "I'll tell you how I got started with Lark. I was at a party. And someone offered me a cigarette. I liked it. It was a Lark." And the woman shopper: "I can show you my carton. As a matter of fact, I'll show you two cartons. One for me. And one for my husband. You might say we're a two-Lark family.

Lark is a perfectly splendid name for today's Cigarette—no longer are we concerned with athletes, but with fun-lovers. Without actually becoming involved in anything, they enjoy nothing more than watching the others, the doers. In the Ski-Jump Epic, for example, we watch a skier soar gracefully from the high jump. Beautiful. But he's not the smoker. The smoker is standing beside the ski jump taking movie pictures with a hand-held camera he just received from Raleigh's "famous coupons."

The current big Raleigh winners are talking up card tables and cameras and short-wave radios and a tackle box. The men are generally on the far side of 40, but rugged, with beautifully lined faces and hair that takes to decks of silver nicely. The women are 15 years their junior and they're always at settings that hint at affluence.

They're at the horse show watching the jumpers; they're out watching some skeet shooting; they're at the travel agent's listening to a pitch about Jamaica; they're sitting in the middle of the crowd in a circus tent and they're having this fantastically intimate conversation.

"It's the light touch," the man says. "Just the right touch of menthol," the woman comes back quickly.

Sometimes, fortunately, we are spared the sweet talk. In the Winston commercials ("Find folks with a knack for having fun, and you'll find Winstons") the young couple is at country fair—both are wearing their week end tweeds and both are watching the horse race.

Of course, today's young people, so intelligent, would not be tempted by this kind of thing. They've been told repeatedly that Cigarette causes cancer. And they're no longer subjected to all those bogus scientific claims. Even the questionable Lark commercials ("Only Lark's filter has two outer sections, plus an inner chamber of charcoal granules . . .") makes no specific health claims. Nor does the new True commercial that once again lists tar and nicotine ratings before asking solemnly, "For a lot of good reasons, shouldn't your brand be True?" And the other brands that are spending so much time concentrating on science before adding, almost as an afterthought, "No health claim is intended or implied."

No, cigarette wins this year's Star-of-the-Year award on the strength of its own performance. Because—and all due credit here to the Cigarette Advertising Code—these ads are clearly not designed to impress the young. Not unless they enjoy going to horse shows and circuses and ski meets. Not unless they find the idea of movie stars and jazz musicians and stunt pilots appealing. Not unless they respond favorably to an endless progression of nubile women handling Cigarette with infinite and gentle respect. There

1005022510

and be no appeal to young people here unless they enjoy the idea of building skyscrapers or piloting their own schooners—or perhaps someday being a cowboy with a helicopter.

MR. KENNEDY: Of New York. The cigarette industry and the advertising and broadcasting industries which it helps to support are a powerful block of economic power in this country. But the fact is that they are dealing in a lethal product. I would wager that if the economic power of the cigarette and related industries were as minuscule as that of the marihuana industry, cigarettes would long ago have been prohibited and their sale saddled with severe penalties as a health hazard. Still, cigarettes are a multibillion dollar industry and we must frame whatever action we take in that practical context.

Some things have already been done. In 1965, Congress passed a law requiring that a warning label be placed on the side of every cigarette package. Also in 1965, the National Clearinghouse for Smoking and Health was established in the Public Health Service. This new agency has begun a variety of educational and other experimental projects in dozens of cities around the country. The American Cancer Society continues its fine efforts to educate the public about the dangers of cigarette smoking. And the Surgeon General's report has had its effect.

The fact is that smoking has not increased at the same astronomical rate in the last few years as it did earlier. Cigarette consumption is about 25 percent below what it would be if the trends of the late 1940's and early 1950's had continued. And, in addition to the 48 million cigarette smokers in the country there are some 19 million former smokers. Half of the physicians who smoked 10 years ago have stopped. But 542 billion cigarettes were still consumed in the country last year, 4,290 cigarettes for every man and woman over the age of 18. Clearly, our efforts to encourage people to quit smoking and to discourage young people from starting need to be expanded.

Here are some of the things that I think we could do now.

First, we in Congress can pass the legislation which Senator Magnuson has introduced today, the importance of which he has described so well. A recent study by Buffalo, New York's distinguished Roswell Park Memorial Institute showed a reduction in the amount of tar and nicotine in cigarettes, so this legislation could well encourage some of the more lethal brands to reduce their tar and nicotine content. I ask unanimous consent that a news report from the New York Times about the Roswell Park study be inserted in the Record at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CIGARETTE BRANDS RATED ON SAFETY—CANCER CENTER STUDY URGES SMOKING OF PRODUCTS WITH LOW TAR AND NICOTINE—56 TYPES ARE ANALYZED—INDUSTRY ASKED TO DEVELOP BETTER FILTERS FOR THOSE WHO CANNOT BREAK HABIT

(By Jane E. Brody)

A leading cancer research institute, reporting yesterday on its analysis of tar and nicotine content of 56 brands of cigarettes, advised smokers who cannot break the habit to switch to brands that contain low quantities of these harmful substances.

It said that "changes in this direction offer appreciable public health gains."

The study was done by Dr. George E. Moore and his associates at Roswell Park Memorial Institute, New York State's cancer research and treatment center in Buffalo. The report was published in the March issue of *Cancer*, the journal of the American Cancer Society.

The study showed that "some filters on cigarettes are helpful but others are not adequately protecting people," Dr. Moore said in a statement yesterday.

"Our study and information from the tobacco industry itself indicates that more effective filters can be developed," he stated.

"We believe that improved filters would help stop needless and premature loss of life each year from lung cancer, certain other kinds of cancer, emphysema, cardiovascular disease, and other diseases associated with heavy smoking," he said.

Asked about the Roswell Park report, various cigarette manufacturers said they would prefer to reserve comment until they had carefully reviewed the study.

LOWEST IN CONTENT

In the analysis of the 56 brands, Marvel and Cascade, both King-size filter-tipped cigarettes manufactured by Stephens Brothers, ranked lowest in tar and nicotine content. The 56 brands represented nearly all those marketed in the United States at the time of the study.

Marvel yielded an average of 8.3 milligrams of tar and 0.32 milligrams of nicotine per cigarette, and Cascade yielded 0.1 milligrams of tar and 0.34 milligrams of nicotine.

The highest tar and nicotine content was found in unfiltered King-size Raleighs, a product of the Brown and Williamson Tobacco Corporation. A typical Raleigh contains 43.4 milligrams of tar and 2.64 milligrams of nicotine, the study showed.

One of the study's most disturbing findings, according to the scientists, was that one filtered cigarette—King-size Pall Mall—yielded more tar and nicotine than the unfiltered size cigarette of the same brand.

In tests of Chesterfield, Lucky Strike and Camels, the scientists found that the smoker gets as much or more tar and nicotine from the filter cigarette as from the unfiltered, regular cigarette of the same brand.

The study also showed that some filters are much better than others. The Marvel filter, for instance, was nearly five times more effective in blocking tar than the Pall Mall filter.

Dr. Moore observed in a telephone interview that cigarette advertising had given smokers the impression that filters would protect them from the dangers of smoking.

"Unfortunately, in many cases, they are not being protected," the doctor said.

Numerous studies have shown that cigarette smokers are much more likely than nonsmokers to suffer from lung cancer.

CIGARETTE RATINGS

Following is a table giving the average tar and nicotine per cigarette in milligrams:

[In milligrams]

Brand	Type ¹	Tar	Nicotine
Marvel	KF	8.3	0.32
Cascade	KMF	0.1	.34
Gulf	KF	9.7	.74
Kings	KFD	15.0	.39
Duke	KF	12.6	.37
Lite	KF	13.6	.97
True	KF	15.8	.80
Kent	KF	15.8	1.10
Camel	KMF	21.1	1.15
Springer	KMF	21.7	1.16
Galaxy	KMF	22.1	1.16
Mulgibson	KF	22.1	1.24
Winston	KF	22.9	1.32
Old Gold	KF	23.0	1.32
Stephens	KF	23.0	1.36
Lark	KF	23.1	1.36
Philip Morris	KF	23.3	1.36
Newport	KMF	23.3	1.36
Viceroy	KF	23.4	1.64
Salem	KMF	23.8	1.43
Gold	KMF	23.8	1.43
Wellman	KMF	24.0	1.44
L & M	KF	24.9	1.12
Benson & Hedges	R.F.	25.0	1.33
Tempo	KF	25.1	1.35
Torino	KF	25.3	1.33
Alpine	KMF	25.4	1.52
Kool	KMF	25.6	1.58

Chesterfield	R	21.8	1.14
Lucky Strike	KMF	21.1	1.35
Davidoff	KF	21.3	1.42
Chesterfield	KF	21.6	1.72
Raleigh	KF	21.8	1.94
Philip Morris	R	21.8	1.37
Belair	KMF	22.1	1.11
Orbit	KF	22.7	1.63
Montane	KF	23.0	1.67
Players	R	23.3	1.70
Cancer	R	23.4	1.77
Camels	KF	23.4	1.78
York	K	23.6	1.75
Pall Mall	K	23.6	1.69
Hazl & Half	KF	23.8	1.44
Duke	K	24.1	1.43
Old Gold	KF	24.8	1.83
Masterpiece	R.M.	25.9	2.21
Kool	K	26.7	1.73
Fatima	K	27.2	2.11
Philip Morris	K	28.0	2.35
Brandon	KF	28.3	2.22
Benson & Hedges 107	KF	41.1	2.45
Holiday	K	41.5	1.97
Torino	KF	41.6	2.20
Pall Mall	KF	43.4	2.64
Kool	K	43.4	2.64

¹K—King (80 to 100 millimeters), R—regular (70 millimeters), F—filter, M—menthol, D—denicotinized.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York.

Second, we simply must begin to regulate cigarette advertising. The advertising and broadcasting industries have, in my judgment, done an unsuccessful job of self-regulation. I believe their respective codes are inadequate. I think it is time the Federal Communications Commission started showing an interest in this matter. There is a strong argument that the FCC has the power, in connection with its power to refuse to renew licenses of stations that do not operate in the public interest, to prevent or limit the advertising of products which are harmful to health. It would also appear that the FCC could—and should—require the acceptance of advertising detailing the hazards of cigarette smoking as a public service under the ruble of the "fairness" doctrine. At the very least, the FCC should begin applying pressure on the broadcasters and the tobacco industry to adopt a more stringent code of self-regulation. Similar action has been effective in keeping hard liquor advertising off the air. If the FCC has not taken any action by the end of this year, and the cigarette companies and the broadcasters have not taken any further self-regulatory action in the same period, I plan to introduce legislation to mandate an experimental 1-year ban on all cigarette advertising on radio and television. I might point out that this is not a drastic step. Great Britain has had exactly such a ban since August 1965, and the figures so far, although still quite tentative, seem to show a steady drop in cigarette consumption since that time.

Third, we must vastly expand our educational activities about the hazards of cigarette smoking. The National Clearinghouse only gets \$2 million a year for all of its activities. I plan to seek to amend its appropriation this year in order to at least triple that amount. With such added funds the Clearinghouse could develop a national antismoking campaign which would use radio, television, and newspapers.

Finally, I think it would be useful to have a sliding scale tax on cigarettes so that higher taxes are paid for cigarettes which contain more tar and nicotine. This would effectively encourage the development of relatively less harmful cigarettes. I plan to introduce such legislation in the near future.

All of these efforts are vital. But in the end none will have any effect until Americans—and particularly young people—develop an awareness themselves of the magnitude of the hazard, and act accordingly.

1005022511